UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,784	04/09/2001	Richard L. Schwartz	SMIO.0100003	1551

31625 7590 03/18/2004

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039

EXAMINER	
BASOM, BLAINE T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	8

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/829,784	SCHWARTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Blaine Basom	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-101* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-101* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6 and 7*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it simply lists the features recited in claim 1, and thus does not describe the invention such that it sufficiently assists readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure:

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 46, 53, 60, and 101 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 46 recites, "enabling the mediation subscriber communication device to displaying the availability selector." Such language is grammatically improper. Claim 53 recites, "receive, at the from a mediation system, a data including a contextual communication summary." Such language is grammatically improper. Claim 60 recites, "enabling the mediation subscriber communication device to transmit...a data including said selected one of the follow-through

action." Such language is grammatically improper. Claim 101 recites, "the voice network includes a computer-telephone interface client sever." It is believed that "sever" is intended to be "server." Regardless, a "client server" is confusing. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-9, 36, 46-52, 78-86, 92, 95, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claim 3, there is no antecedent basis for "the availability selector." Claims 4-9 depend on claim 3, and include all of the features of claim 3, therefore rendering these dependent claims indefinite. Additionally, in claim 8, there is no antecedent basis for "one of the availability selectors," as claim 3, upon which claim 8 depends, recites only a single availability selector. In claim 36, there is no antecedent basis for "displaying the availability selector." Regarding claim 46, there is no antecedent basis for "the availability selector." Claims 47-52 depend on claim 46, and include all of the features of claim 46, therefore rendering these dependent claims indefinite. Additionally, in claim 51, there is no antecedent basis for "one of the availability selectors," as claim 46, upon which claim 51 depends, recites only a single availability selector. In reference to claims 78-86, there is no antecedent basis for "the computer program product." In claim 92, there is no antecedent basis

for "the availability selector." As per claim 95, there is no antecedent basis for "the options menu selection." In claim 99, there is no antecedent basis for "the mediation information menu."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 18, 24-27, 29, 32-33, 44-52, 61, 67-70, 72, 75-76, and 100-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,373,817, which is attributed to Kung et al. (and hereafter referred to as "Kung"). In general, Kung presents a system for automatically transferring a telephone call or the like to a communication subscriber, whereby the call is transferred to a location or device depending on the subscriber's schedule (see column 34, lines 11-57). Consequently, Kung is considered to teach a method for facilitating mediated virtual communication.

Specifically regarding claim 1, Kung teaches that mediation information, such as the subscriber's schedule and associated contact information, may be displayed on a visual display portion of the mediation subscriber's communication device, specifically a network computer (for example, see column 34, lines 11-57; and column 36, lines 36-60). The subscriber may designate, via the data interface portion of the mediation subscriber's communication device,

selected mediation information, for example, in order to modify the subscriber's schedule and associated contact information (see column 34, lines 11-57). Lastly, it is understood that this selected mediation information is transmitted from the mediation subscriber's communication device to a mediation system, which comprises an "IP Central Station" and a "BRG," the "IP Central Station" and "BRG" transferring calls to the subscriber according to the subscriber's schedule and contact information (for example, see column 34, lines 20-57).

In reference to claim 44, Kung discloses that the above method may be implemented via a computer program processable by a data processor to implement a mediation subscriber communication device, and an apparatus from which the computer program is accessible by the data processor (for example, see column 19, line 27 – column 20, line 31). Consequently, such a computer program implementing the above-described method of Kung is considered a "computer program product," like that recited in claim 44.

Regarding claims 100 and 101, Kung also discloses that the above-described method may be implemented via a mediation subscriber's communication device connected to a network comprising an "IP central station" (for example, see column 4, lines 1-60). Consequently, such a device and network implementing the above-described method is considered to compose a system, like that expressed in claim 100, which is for facilitating mediated virtual communication. Kung further discloses that the mediation subscriber's communication device, which facilitates display, designation, and transmission of mediation information, may be a web-equipped terminal capable of accessing and displaying a web page from the IP Central Station, or a telephone capable of interacting with a voice response system provided by the IP Central Station (see column 36, lines 36-60). Additionally, Kung discloses that the above-described

system comprises a data packet server, which is included within the IP central station (for example, see column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 43) and a data packet client, specifically the subscriber's web-equipped, which accesses and displays web pages from the IP central station's server (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60). Thus regarding claim 101, Kung teaches that the above-described communication system includes a data packet client, namely a web-equipped terminal, a computer-telephone interface client, specifically the subscriber's telephone, and a data packet server, which is comprised within the IP central station. Moreover, it is understood that this system comprises a computer-telephone interface server, which is included within the IP central station, and an interactive voice response system connected to the computer-telephone interface (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60).

As per claims 2-9 and 45-52, Kung discloses that the mediation information displayed by the mediation subscriber's communication device may comprise a schedule of the subscriber's locations during particular periods of the day or week, and information for contacting the subscriber at each specific location (see column 34, lines 20-57). The subscriber may modify this schedule and contact information in order to modify how the subscriber is accessed by a calling party (see column 34, line 20 – column 36, line 4). Consequently, this schedule and associated contact information is considered an "availability selector," like that recited in claim 2, as it designates the subscriber's availability. Specifically regarding claim 3, the subscriber's schedule and contact information, an example of which is shown in figure 7(a), may be displayed on the screen of the subscriber's computer terminal (see column 36, lines 36-60). This schedule may indicate the subscriber's presence associated with a meeting, may indicate the subscriber's presence associated with a designated time of day, may indicate the subscriber's presence

associated with a day, and may comprise information regarding the priority of a calling party's communication request (see column 34, line 20 – column 36, line 4). The subscriber manipulates a data interface portion of the mediation subscriber's communication device in order to designate his or her availability status during particular portions of the schedule (for example, see column 34, lines 20-40). Lastly, it is understood that this availability status information is transmitted from the mediation subscriber's communication device to a mediation system, which comprises an "IP Central Station" and a "BRG," the "IP Central Station" and "BRG" transferring calls to the user according to the user's availability status information (for example, see column 34, lines 20-57).

Regarding claims 18, 24, 25, 61, 67, and 68, Kung presents a method and product like that of claims 1 and 44, respectively, the method and product entailing displaying mediation information on a display portion of a mediation subscriber's communication device, as is shown above. Kung specifically teaches that such mediation information includes the subscriber's schedule, according to which telephone calls and the like are transferred to the subscriber. Particularly, this schedule and various options associated therewith may be accessed via a menu provided by a web page (see column 36, lines 36-60). Consequently, Kung is considered to teach receiving, at the mediation subscriber's computer terminal, i.e. communication device, data including a plurality of options menu selections, whereby these options menu selections are displayed. It is understood that the subscriber manipulates a data interface portion of the mediation subscriber's communication device in order to select one of the options menu selections (see column 34, lines 20-40; and column 36, lines 36-60). In response, the selected option is transmitted from the mediation subscriber's communication device to a mediation

system, thus resulting in access to information related to the selected option, such as the subscribers schedule (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60).

Regarding claims 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 69, 70, 72, 75, and 76, Kung presents a method and product like that of claims 1 and 44, respectively, the method and product each entailing displaying mediation information on a display portion of a mediation subscriber's communication device, as is shown above. Kung specifically teaches that such mediation information includes the subscriber's schedule, according to which telephone calls and the like are transferred to the subscriber. Particularly, this schedule and various options associated therewith may be accessed via a menu provided by a web page (see column 36, lines 36-60). Consequently, Kung is considered to teach receiving, at the mediation subscriber's computer terminal, i.e. communication device, data including a mediation information menu, whereby this menu is particularly displayed via a web page. Such a menu may particularly be used to access the subscriber's schedule, which as described above is used to modify the subscriber's availability status. Consequently, such a menu is considered an "availability status menu," like that expressed in claims 27 and 70. Additionally, this menu may comprise various options, as is shown above in the rejection for claim 18. This menu is therefore also considered an "options menu," like that recited in claims 29 and 72. It is understood that the subscriber manipulates a data interface portion, of the mediation subscriber's communication device in order to select one of the menu selections (see column 34, lines 20-40; and column 36, lines 36-60). In response, the selection is transmitted from the mediation subscriber's communication device to a mediation system, thus resulting in access to information related to the selection, such as the subscribers schedule (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-12, 14-17, 28, 34-36, 38, 53-55, 57-60, 71, 77-79, 81, 87-88, 90-92, and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent of Kung, which is described above, and also over U.S. Patent No. 5,327,486, which is attributed to Wolff et al. (and hereafter referred to as "Wolff"). As shown above, Kung presents a method and program product like that of claims 1 and 44, respectively, the method and product involving displaying mediation information on a display portion of a mediation subscriber's communication device. Kung specifically teaches that such mediation information includes the subscriber's schedule, according to which telephone calls and the like are transferred to the subscriber. The subscriber can thus be contacted no matter where he or she is located. Kung, however, does not explicitly disclose that the mediation information comprises a contextual communication summary and a plurality of follow-through actions, whereby as expressed in claims 10 and 53, this contextual communication summary and plurality of follow through actions are displayed. Consequently, Kung does not disclose that the follow through actions comprise a selection for indicating that a message will be taken, a selection for indicating that the mediation subscriber will initiate a return call in a designated number of minutes, a selection for indicating that the mediation subscriber would like to schedule a return call, and a selection for enabling an incoming call to be transferred, as is expressed in claims 11-12, 14-15, 54-55, and 57-58.

Wolff complements the teachings of Kung, describing telecommunications systems which enable the user to be reached by telephone, no matter where the user is located (see column 1, lines 13-37). Regarding the claimed invention, Wolff discloses that it would be beneficial for users to be able to screen calls, such that they may be contacted by only those individuals with which they want to communicate (see column 1, lines 38-60). To this end, Wolff discloses that the user's network computer may receive and display data including a contextual communication summary, which identifies the calling party, and also a plurality of follow-through actions, each selectable by the user to perform a specific function in response to the call (see column 1, line 63 – column 2, line 49). One such follow-through action transfers the caller to voice mail, or in other words, indicates that a message will be taken (see column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 24). Specifically regarding claims 12 and 14, another follow-through action described by Wolff is selectable to send a text message indicating that the user would like to schedule a return call, specifically expressing that the user will call the calling party back in a designated number of minutes (see column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 24; and column 6, lines 37-45). Lastly, Wolff discloses that another follow-through action enables the incoming call to be transferred to the user's current location or to a different person (see column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 24). The user manipulates a data interface portion of the user's network computer in order to select one of the follow-through actions (see column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 24). In response, data indicating the selected follow-through action is transmitted from the user's network computer for reception by a mediation system (see column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 24).

It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kung and Wolff before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the network computer taught by Kung, such that it receives and displays a contextual communication summary and a plurality of follow-through actions, as is done by the network computer taught by Wolff. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such a combination because such features allow important calls to get through to the user, while other calls that may waste the user's time are deferred, as is taught by Wolff (see column 1, lines 37-60).

Specifically regarding claims 28 and 71, the above-described follow-through actions taught by Wolff are understood to be displayed via a menu (for example, see figure 4). The above-described combination of Kung and Wolff thus teaches receiving, at the mediation subscriber communication device from a mediation system, data including a mediation information menu, whereby this menu is displayed to the user, and whereby this menu specifically comprises various follow-through actions. Consequently, such a menu is considered a "follow-through" action menu, like that recited in claims 28 and 71.

Claim 34 is directed to a method with similar features to claims 1, 10, 16, and 17, combined. Claim 34 is therefore believed to be anticipated by the above-described combination of Kung and Wolff, particularly by the reasons presented above in the rejections for claims 1, 10, 16, and 17. In reference to claim 77, Kung discloses that this method may be implemented via a computer program processable by a data processor to implement a mediation subscriber communication device, and an apparatus from which the computer program is accessible by the data processor (for example, see column 19, line 27 – column 20, line 31). Consequently, such a computer program implementing this method of Kung and Wolff is considered a "computer

program product," like that recited in claim 77. Furthermore, claims 35, 36, 78, and 79 are further believed to be anticipated by the above-described combination of Kung and Wolff, due to the additional reasons presented by the rejections for claims 2-7 above. Also, because of the additional reasons shown above in the rejection for claim 18, claims 38 and 81 are additionally believed to be anticipated by Kung and Wolff.

Regarding claims 87, 88, 90-92, and 94 Kung discloses that the above-described method may be implemented via a mediation subscriber's communication device connected to a network comprising an "IP central station" (for example, see column 4, lines 1-60). Consequently, such a device and network is considered to compose a system, like that expressed in claim 87, which is for facilitating mediated virtual communication. Kung further discloses that the mediation subscriber's communication device, which facilitates display, designation, and transmission of mediation information, may be a web-equipped terminal capable of accessing and displaying a web page from an "IP Central Station." It is interpreted that such a web-equipped terminal may be a wireless telephone, such as a cell phone, which is capable of accessing and displaying web information, as is known in the art (see also column 4, lines 23-60, and column 19, line 27 – column 20, line 31). Regarding claim 90, Kung further discloses that the above-described system comprises a data packet server, which is included within the IP central station (for example, see column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 43) and a data packet client, specifically the subscriber's communication device, which accesses and displays web pages from the IP central station's server (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60). Claims 91 and 92 are further believed to be anticipated by the above-described combination of Kung and Wolff, due to the additional reasons presented by the rejections for claims 2-7 above. Also, because of the reasons shown

above in the rejection for claim 18, claim 94 additionally believed to be anticipated by Kung and Wolff.

Claims 13, 37, 56, 80, and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kung and Wolff, which is described above, and also over U.S. Patent No. 5,758,280, which is attributed to Kimura. As shown above, the combination of Kung and Wolff presents a method and product like that of claims 10 and 53, respectively, whereby a plurality of follow-through actions are received and displayed by a mediation subscriber's communication device, specifically a network computer. This combination, however, does not explicitly disclose a follow-through action for indicating that the mediation subscriber will initiate a return call when the mediation subscriber is next available, as is recited in claims 13 and 56.

Like the above-described combination of Kung and Wolff, Kimura presents a system whereby a called party is provided with information, displayed on a network computer, which identifies the calling party (see column 1, lines 50-67). The called party is then provided with a plurality of options, each selectable to perform a function in response to the call (see column 1, line 50-67). Specifically regarding the claimed invention, one such option is selectable in order to send a text message to the calling party, the text message indicating that the user will call the calling party back, or in other words, initiate a return call when he or she is next available (see figure 3 and its associated description in column 3, lines 10-26).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kung, Wolff, and Kimura before him at the time the invention was made, to modify

the plurality of follow-through actions taught by Kung and Wolf to include the follow-through action taught by Kimura, which results in the transmission of text message indicating that the user will call the calling party being. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize this combination because such a text message is useful in certain circumstances, particularly when the user does not know an exact number of minutes to specify that the calling party should call back, as is demonstrated by Kimura.

Claims 37, 80, and 93 are directed to a method, product, and system with similar features to claims 11-15, combined. Claims 37, 80, and 93 are therefore believed to be anticipated by the above-described combination of Kung, Wolff, and Kimura, particularly due to the reasons presented above in the rejections for claims 11-15, 34, 77, and 87.

Claims 19-23, 30-31, 62-66, and 73-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent of Kung, which is described above, and also over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,778, which is attributed to Buhrmann et al. (and hereafter referred to as "Buhrmann"). As shown above, Kung presents a method and product like that of claims 18 and 61, respectively, the method and product involving receiving a plurality of options menu selections, whereby these options menu selections are displayed via a display portion of the mediation subscriber's communication device. Kung specifically teaches that such menu selections are used to access and maintain the subscriber's schedule, according to which telephone calls and the like are transferred to the subscriber (for example, see column 36, lines 36-60). Kung, however, does not explicitly disclose that the options menu selections comprise a selection for enabling a call to be made, a selection for enabling a service reservation to be made, a selection for enabling

an availability to be altered, a selection for enabling a policy to be altered, and a selection for enabling a service preference to be altered, as is expressed in claims 19-23 and 62-66.

Like Kung, Buhrmann describes telecommunications systems which enable the user to be reached by telephone, no matter where the user is located, and in accordance with the user's schedule (see column 3, line 49 – column 4, line 17). Regarding the claimed invention, Buhrmann teaches presenting various options corresponding to the user's schedule. For example, Buhrmann teaches that a "call completion request" may be selected by the user, whereby such a request provides a service which enables calls to be forwarded during a particular period in the user's schedule (see column 7, line 31 – column 8, line 19). Buhrmann therefore teaches providing an option for enabling a service reservation to be made, one such service reservation, call forwarding, further enabling a call to be made. By the same reasoning, Buhrmann teaches providing an option enabling a service preference to be altered. Additionally, Buhrmann discloses that the user has the option of modifying his or her schedule, thus altering his or her availability (for example, see column 7, lines 31-60). Lastly, Buhrmann discloses that the user may be presented with the option of overriding a particular policy, such as for example, that during a scheduled meeting, all calls to the user are to be forwarded to voice mail (see column 8, line 59 – column 9, line 18).

Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kung and Buhrmann before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the menu taught by Kung, such that it provides selection for enabling a call to be made, a selection for enabling a service reservation to be made, a selection for enabling an availability to be altered, a selection for enabling a policy to be altered, and a selection for enabling a service

preference to be altered, as is taught by Buhrmann. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize this combination because such options provide the user with more control over how he or she is reached, as is demonstrated by Buhrmann.

Specifically regarding claims 30, 31, 73, and 74, the above-described options taught by Buhrmann are displayed via a menu. As described above, such options include options for enabling a service reservation to be made, and options for arranging the user's schedule. The above-described combination of Kung and Wolff thus teaches receiving, at the mediation subscriber communication device from a mediation system, data including a mediation information menu, whereby this menu is displayed to the user, and whereby this menu specifically comprises such options. Consequently, this a menu is considered a "services menu," like that recited in claims 30 and 73, an also, an "arrangement options menu," like that expressed in claims 31 and 74.

Claims 39-43, 82-86, 89, 95-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kung, Wolff, and Buhrmann, each of which is described above. As shown above, Kung and Wolff present a method, product, and system, like that of claims 38, 81, and 91, respectively. For the reasons described above in the rejections for claims 19-23, Buhrmann teaches that such a method, product, and system may involve displaying options menu selections consisting of an options menu selection for enabling a call to be made, an options menu selection for enabling a service reservation to be made, an options menu selection for enabling an availability to be altered, an options menu selection for enabling a policy to be altered, and an options menu selection for enabling a service preference to be altered.

Furthermore, and for the reasons presented above in the rejections for claims 24 and 25, claims 40-41, 83-84, and 96-97 are additionally believed to be anticipated by this combination of Kung, Wolff, and Buhrmann. Lastly, this combination of Kung, Wolff, and Buhrmann is also believed to teach the method, product, and system recited in claims 42-43, 85-86, and 98-99, particularly for the reasons described in the rejections for claims 26-31 above.

Specifically regarding claim 89, the combination of Kung and Wolff, as described above in the rejections for claims 87 and 88, teaches a system for facilitating mediated virtual communication, comprising a mediation subscriber communication device, such as a wireless phone, which is capable of facilitating display, designation, and transmission of mediation information. Kung further discloses that this communication device may be connected to the mediation system, comprising an "IP Central Station," via a data packet network (for example see column 4, lines 1-22). However, neither Kung nor Wolff explicitly teach that this data packet network includes a general packet radio service, wherein the wireless telephone is capable of communicating via a general packet radio system, as is recited in claim 89. As shown above, Buhrmann similarly presents a system whereby a user is provided with mediation information, displayed on a network device, which identifies such information as the user's schedule. Calls are then forwarded to the user, based on this schedule, as is further shown above. Regarding the claimed invention, Buhrmann discloses that the network device may be a wireless telephone connected to a data packet network comprising a general packet radio service, whereby it is understood that the wireless telephone is capable of communicating via a general packet radio system (see column 5, lines 18-51; and column 12, lines 34-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kung, Wolff, and Buhrmann

before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the wireless phone taught by Kung and Wolff such that it capable of communicating via a general packet radio system, which as taught by Buhrmann, is included within the data packet network. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such a combination, because a data packet radio system is a standard communication medium for a wireless telephone, as is demonstrated by Buhrmann.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. §1.111(C) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. Particularly, the U.S. Patent of Smith et al. cited therein describes an integrated message center which involves displaying and selecting information on a mediation subscriber's communication device. The Shaffer et al. U.S. Patent cited therein presents a method for using a telephone to access, display, and transmit scheduling information. Lastly, the Gerzberg et al. U.S. Patent cited therein describes an apparatus capable of facilitating display, designation, and transmission of mediation information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blaine Basom whose telephone number is (703) 305-7694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7238.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

btb

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100